

General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
January 28, 2003
Revised March 11, 2003

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Allison Rolfe	SD Audubon Society
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development (<i>Note: Proxy for BIA</i>)
Carolyn Chase	SD Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Dave Shibley	Save Our Land Values
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Liz Higgins	SD Association of Realtors
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association (<i>Note: not in attendance for entire meeting</i>)
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Scott Thomas	American Institute of Architects
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects

Public at Large:

Al Cox	Caltrans
Dr. Almeda Starkey	
Carol Leone	
Charlene Ayers	
Chris Anderson	SDAR
D. Pallinger	Ramona
Daniel Brunton	Latham & Watkins/Rancho Guejito
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona CPG
Eric Larson	Farm Bureau
Hank Rupp	Rancho Guejito
J. Tanalski	Valley Center
Jeanne Pagett	
Jerry Winter	
Karen Tucker	FLC
Lynne Baker	EHL
Mary Allison	USDRIC & ECPOA
Michael Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Patti Krebs	Guejito
Paul B. Etzel	SDSU/Astronomy Dept.
Paul Gebert	SDCWA
Peng Tan	
Ron Wootton	SDRD/Vessels
Suzanne McKenna	
Wallace Tucker	SDCTC

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)	Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)	Tom Harron (County Counsel)
LeAnn Carmichael (DPLU)	

Agenda Item I: Logistics –

- Scarborough emphasized that the planning commission is only being asked to accept the following products for continued refinements and progress so this is not a conclusory meeting but rather establishing their basic knowledge as it has been a while since the planning commission has heard anything on the general plan.
- Chase asked what the preferred land use map and community map in process are that are being run for transportation modeling (pp. 7 of staff report) and whether the modeling information is out for review yet. Holler replied that SANDAG has been running transportation models on two maps – the Working Copy – December 2002 and Interim Interest Group maps. The data is being worked on by our consultants and staff is unsure of its availability by the 31st but would like to have it at least prior to discussions on some community areas. Chase stated that information needs to be made public at least 72 hours in advance with regards to the public hearing process.
- Bowlby asked for clarification on the preferred land use map. Holler reiterated that the model was ran on both maps and the idea was to present a map to the commission, however, not knowing how this group was going to resolve that issue, staff ran both maps in order to have data on both maps.
- Whalen asked for clarification on the preferred land use map. Scarborough explained that the statement in the report may be inaccurately stated. There has not been a choice made on the preferred map; conceivably we are headed towards one map but both maps were run for transportation. Holler explained that the Interim interest Group map differs from the Working Copy in that the Working Copy is more of a synthesis product – there is input from the individual planning/sponsor groups, from the Steering Committee, and members of the public, including input from the Interest Group.

Agenda Item II: Standards Package –

a) Goals & Policies

- Silver stated that he had assumed staff would be looking at the Steering Committee/Board adopted goals and policies and the ones that came out of the Interest Group, to make a third column for staff recommendations in order to reconcile the differences. Suggested that people write their suggestions to staff during a time period. Scarborough stated that it is a public process and the concept is that it would ultimately be reconciled but not as a part of this package and advocated that the Interest Group support what has already been voted on.
- Bowlby reminded everyone that in 2000, the Interest Group at that time considered the first draft of the goals and policies in concert with the Steering Committee and the input provided was most often accepted and incorporated. When the goals and policies had gone to the Board for endorsement in 2001, there was a great deal of consensus between the two groups. Thinks we need to refer to the goals and policies as Board endorsed as we go forward.
- Stepner stated that industrial land is a regional issue and that language should not reside only with the community planning and sponsor groups but rather be brought forward to the Interest Group for their participation in policy development (pp. 5 in staff report). Holler noted that it will be done at a future date.
- **Vote:** The Interest Group agreed unanimously to support the goals and policies.
 - ❖ **Correction made at the March 11, 2003 meeting:** No vote was taken at this meeting on goals and policies. There was general agreement by the Interest Group to forward the goals and policies to the Planning Commission as previously voted upon (as individual policies).
- Stehly wanted to go on record to make it clear that this group wants a complete package and reserves the right to object to the plan unless it is a complete package.
- **Motion:** Chase moved that their first group communication to the Planning Commission be that they wish to continue their work because they want to see a complete package.
- **Amendment:** Whalen added that the Planning Commission be requested to not take any action whatsoever on Friday as a result of further proceeding meetings. Holler replied that he hopes the commission would take an action that would essentially be in concert with what is indicated in the staff report and suggested adding a piece that clarified a complete package.
- Stehly stated that incremental acceptance is okay but incremental implementation is a problem. Holler responded that we are asking technically for neither at this point in time and what we have

put before the commission is to accept the products for continued refinement and progress, which is not an adoption.

- Shibley stated that the ordinances need to be adopted and approved along with the general plan concurrently and wanted to see the equity mechanisms raised to the level with the ordinances so that these all can get adopted at the same time. Holler replied that it is not possible for staff to write all these sections and ordinances concurrent with this process. Stated that we have talked about putting those pieces in statements of legislative intents to address those specific concerns, in which the Board would ultimately take action to direct staff to address those concerns in subsequent ordinances if that is our intent.
- Stepner clarified the motion: 1) The group is requesting that the commission take no formal action on an adoption of anything except the report, 2) the group wants to continue the process so we can continue to refine and develop whatever needs to be developed, and 3) although this Interest Group is made up of a number of organizations who have voted unanimously on various goals and policies, each organization reserves the right to oppose the plan if they deem the package incomplete. Whalen seconded the motion.
- Whalen commented that he was not sure if the legislative intent package is going to be enough to comprise a package because there are so many details associated with ordinances. Stated that it needs to be clear that any Board approval in March or April will not be final as the direction to staff to produce documents will need to go through a series of discussions and approval and ultimately be brought back for final approval. Holler reiterated that we cannot be tasked with a comprehensive revision to the zoning ordinance in concert with the general plan process.
- Bowlby asked when the Board is expected to adopt a map. Holler replied that we have to finish an EIR in order for them to adopt anything, which should be at least by the end of the year. By that time, we should certainly have more pieces together and obviously, we will have additional work on ordinances.
- **Vote:** Unanimous.

b) Framework/Regional Categories

- **Motion:** Tabb moved to support the categories as developed. Silver seconded the motion.
- Bowlby thinks it is important to have an agricultural designation to ensure long term protection of agriculture in San Diego County and that the semi-rural was not defined well enough so that it would apply to avoid important resource areas that are to be in the rural designation. Mentions that there are areas along the creeks that are designated 1 du/2 ac and 1 du/10 ac, which is just one example of resources that wound up in the semi-rural category when it should not have been.
- Whalen stated that if we are going to try to focus developments in the areas near the village cores and village, we are going to need a lot bigger than one acre in the semi-rural areas, which was a concern for staff due to an overlap issue. Proposed addressing the issue by treating the semi-rural one-third category (1 du/10 ac to 2.9 du/ac) differently from the village one-third category (2.9 du/ac to 7.3 du/ac) because of different design standards as he cannot see how we can make density equations work without having something denser than one acre in the semi-rural.
- Silver commented that if something in the semi-rural was not appropriate in that it should be denser than 1 du/ac, it should then be re-classified on the map to a village category. If it is a map error then it should be changed rather than changing the categories. Whalen responded that his rationale for the change is to not expand the village areas and if you were to buy into the paradigm that the base building lot in the County of San Diego is a single-family home lot then why would you want to squander the land on one-acre zoning.
- Higgins stated that she was in agreement with Whalen in that we need to find some alternative to increase the density to allow the ability to provide more housing.
- Chase asked if clustering would allow someone to go down to a lower lot size since we are proposing to decouple lot size. Holler agreed and stated that this is a map question rather than a framework question since we have the 2.9 du/ac density category today. It becomes a matter of where it is applied so this is a map question since the 2.9 du/ac is a tool that exists already.
- Coombs was concerned over the increase in population since the map figures does not reflect redevelopment and core densification. Opposes putting more density in the semi-rural as it is best to accommodate it in the village and village support areas.
- Bowlby thinks there needs to be adjustments the other way in semi-rural to bring the population targets back to the 660,000 number or below. Asked if the Steering Committee supported the

categories as they are today. Holler replied that the committee has reviewed them and voted on them as they are today.

- Silver does not think we should be adding any more 1 du/ac and 1 du/2 ac as it is a very inefficient use of land. Not opposed to additional conversion from semi-rural to village but made it clear that it should be done on a planning principle. That kind of density requires services, schools, etc. so it should be done on a map basis rather than changing the category.
- Persuaded by Silver's argument, Whalen suggested selectively re-designating areas to village due to the decoupling of lot size, which deals with building more efficient subdivisions.
- Stepner stated we need to have one more category in the industrial portion that complied more with business parks or something acceptable to the community so we do not get the suburban sprawl/rural industrial park (i.e. auto junkyards). Whalen agreed that we need a business park designation that would be consistent with the residential adjacency as it does not exist today. Holler replied that we are not asking the commission to take any action on industrial designations at this point in time and suggested resolving that issue by working on the text in one of the three proposed industrial designations.
- Chase asked where we are with allowing mixed use in the high density and medium density zones since it would generate more car trips if some sort of local serving mixed use neighborhood commercial as designed is not allowed.
- **Vote:** 13 – 2 – 0

c) Land Use Map

- Bowlby stated that the group has not looked at the list of areas submitted by the building interests, area by area, and the changes that resulted from the previous map to the Interim Interest Group map. The group has never had reconciliation on remaining differences or a meeting to study those issues. Tabb replied that it was never done for the environmental side either. Bowlby stated that it was obvious to him there were changes made in the areas that were being requested for higher densities.
- **Motion:** Silver stated that his view of the Working Copy map is that it is a compromise from both the building and environmental interests, forwarded by staff and community input for consensus. Does not agree with the map completely and thinks all the groups will want to leave the option open to say it should be improved. Knows that this process needs to move forward and that the County needs a project for the EIR. Feels that the Steering Committee and the Interest Group should be unified as the group's strength lies in that unity. Suggested the Working Copy be advanced by this group to the Planning Commission with the recommendation that it move forward as something to work from as the draft EIR is done but it should be understood that it does not represent the preference necessarily of the people on this committee. Stated that they are not ready to support the Working Copy map absent a complete package. Emphasized that the Working Copy is not a starting point for negotiations and compromises particularly in the rural areas as they have really gotten "hammered" in the rural areas in key locations with the community input. Added that this map has gone where it cannot go anymore without fatally compromising the principles we started with. Chase seconded the motion.
- Chase agreed with Higgins to increase village densities and/or potentially increasing the boundaries, however, they would ask that those changes come off the rural side so that we are not increasing population. We have to transfer stuff around and not just add more growth because we already have problems accommodating it for transportation and all the other problems we have.
- Bowlby agreed with Chase and thinks the balance has not occurred in the Working Copy since the target has gone up, which he finds to be significant since we should be steering growth from unincorporated areas in general. Mentions that the Sierra Club has a list of areas that he hopes, in this next iteration of refinements, that staff and the Planning Commissioners would support so that we can achieve a balance and bring the population down and steer things around so that we do have real rural areas closer to the 80% of 80- and 160-acres on the east side.
- Shibley finds it difficult to accept the fact that we have rural designations west of I-15 where water and sewer infrastructure exist; where the majority of those areas are in the city's sphere of influence, which are designated for a future upgrowth. Does not think the group accomplished their intent of shifting growth from east to west.
- Higgins stated that the population numbers will decrease with the increase in commercial business areas so that is a possible component for balancing the numbers.

- Silver stated that it should be understood that all members of the Interest Group may continue to try to make map changes that will improve the map, hopefully consistent with the smart growth principles that we have all agreed upon. He is in favor of what Chase has said but acknowledges that there will be resistance from the communities to increase the village and opposition to decreasing rural densities. In theory, he thinks it should be the group's goal, if map changes are made, to look upon it as a re-distribution.
- Bowlby responded to Shibley's comments stating that it is supposed to be a resourced based plan and so we need to apply the rural designations to protect the resources, watersheds, wetlands, biodiversity, wildlife corridors, etc. It does not make sense to chase those resources from areas that still have them in our county. Responding to the idea that commercial areas are going to replace residential densities in our village and village cores, these maps do not reflect redevelopment areas, which are going to increase population numbers. Another item that may cause a rise in population are the yield formulas for resource protection.
- Chase asked if there were any groups that outright opposed the Working Copy. Holler replied there is a wide range between groups that support it, groups that have not reached a decision on it, and groups that are opposed to it but unaware of any at this point in time that outright reject it.
- Scarborough reiterated the motion: Move forward with the Working Copy with some provisos about reserving our rights to refine it, it is to be part of the package, it will be the project alternative for the EIR but is not a wholesale endorsement by the Interest Group or any members of the Interest Group or subject to wholesale refinement.
- **Amendment:** Silver suggested adding an introductory statement to the motion saying that even though the map represents substantial compromise from all sides, the Interest Group nevertheless recommends that it be advanced, etc.
- Shibley stated that SOLV's position is in opposition because he does not think there is enough density in a designated area to do a viable TDR program, finds that it is inconsistent with the notion of trying to drive growth into the cities and that we are putting rural lands in the cities' spheres of influences, where you need the flexibility to be able to increase density to keep the growth where you want it. Thinks it is basically inconsistent.
- **Amendment:** Chase asked if anyone would be willing to accept that they would like the refinements to be balanced. Higgins asked how you define balanced. Bowlby replied that if you are looking for a bit more in the town center, they will be looking for a bit more in the rural areas. Tabb offered an amendment to: Continue to make refinements but not major changes so long as such refinements are balanced.
- Chase asked if staff has taken a look at spheres of influences because there are serious differences in some plan areas from what we are proposing. Mentions that we will receive comments from cities opposing the density increases because they have sprawl zoning in their spheres of influences, which they probably want to keep. Asked if staff has looked at how many acres that is, where it is, and the difference between the existing general plans. Holler replied that we do have that information. Chase requested a staff report be sent out summarizing existing zoning on spheres of influences versus what we are proposing for the general plan to get a sense of where we are at and maybe actually what some of the communities are objecting to. Stated that it is an important legal point and would like to understand where the overlaps are. Carmichael responded that we have it as a hand colored map now.
- In light of the latest amendment and hopes to go to the Planning Commission with a more positive statement that the group has reached consensus, Tabb suggested modifying the motion by deleting the portion that states it is not a wholesale endorsement.
- Whalen stated that he did not think the group was that far along on the map and was not comfortable with the notion of balanced refinements and refinements in general – one person's major change could mean nothing to another person.
- **Amendment:** Silver amended the motion to: Continue to make refinements but not major changes with the goal of a balanced.... Suggested something along the lines of the group's objective. Also amended wholesale endorsement to complete endorsement.
- Stehly stated that it should end at refinements because by putting in balanced, we are assuming the map is balanced now and that any refinements would throw it out of balance.
- Bowlby stated he hopes that when we say balanced refinement that it takes into consideration, not just from a smart growth perspective, but from an infrastructure perspective which is linked to smart growth.

- **Amendment:** Chase suggested amending the motion to: Continue to make balancing refinements consistent with our goals. Coombs requested to amend the motion to: ...consistent with our concepts A through D and our goals.
- **Vote:** There is a preamble that this represents substantial compromise from the group's original position. Forward the Working Copy – December 2002 map: 1) as the preferred project in the EIR, 2) part of a complete package, 3) not a complete endorsement of the map, and 4) continue to make refinements but not major changes consistent with concepts (A – D) and goals. 16 – 1 – 0.
- **Motion:** Gendron moved to adjourn. Higgins seconded the motion. Unanimous vote.

Agenda Item III: Process –

- a) Status & Next Steps
 - Scarborough stated that there is plenty of work to be done as of today but will adjourn for the day. Added there are meetings on February 11th and 25th, which the group will take up standards, equity mechanisms, and legislative intent.

Agenda Item IV: Public comments –

- Hank Rupp: Represents the Rancho Guejito and is registering position of the Rancho Guejito in that they are vehemently opposed to the proposed designation of 1 du/160 ac and the change in designation. Stated they will take whatever action is needed to prevent the Working Copy map.
- Peng Tan: Family owns 80 acres in Elfin Forest, which is currently at a 2 acre minimum, and is being proposed for 1 du/10 ac. Mentions adjacency to the City of San Marcos, which has sewer, water, and electricity. In the process of annexing the 60 acre lot to San Marcos.
- Dutch Van Dierendonck: Mentions that Guejito is north of Ramona and would be supportive of Mr. Rupp.
- Dr. Starkey: Wanted to know more information about the Forest Conservation Initiative (FCI) and when it sunsets. Harron responded that FCI will be reviewed in 2007 and an overlay will be made.
- Lynne Baker: Stated that multi-family housing is most important in the village core as there are a lot of starters and seniors that need it.
- Ron Wootton: Represents the Vessels Ranch. Mentioned that he has been working with staff to put forth a recommendation.
- Mike Thometz: Mentions that Supervisor Jacob allowed Lake Morena/Campo and Boulevard to use Alt. III, which is much more denser than the Working Copy.